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Abstract

Since its annexation by France in 1532, preserving Brittany's cultural identity has been dependent upon the fluidity of its political relationship with France. As the French Republic came into existence, laws were enacted to suppress minority languages across the Hexagon in favour of French. After the Revolution of 1789, the only language to be used officially, universally and exclusively in matters of education and civic administration became French, at a time when less than half the territory we recognize as France indeed spoke the language. Repressive, violent retaliatory measures were taken whenever linguistic resurgence arose, and such tactics only fueled the flames of nationalism. It was in 1839, at the height of European Celtomania, that the vibrancy of Brittany's ancient culture gained in both stature and appreciation. This revival had been generated by the publication and enormous international success of La Villemarqué's *Barzaz Breiz* ("Songs and Ballads of Brittany"), the cornerstone of Brittany's cultural renaissance. When France fell to the Germans in 1870, a wounded Republic felt even more artistically vulnerable to the onslaught of German Romanticism that had beset the nation since Wagner's operatic successes of the 1840s. A "national nationalism" came into the fore as Camille Saint-Saëns founded the *Société Nationale de Musique*, whose mandate became the "de-Germanization" of French music, and a rediscovery of all that was musically French. France's cultural vulnerability opened a window for Breton literati and musical illuminati towards greater artistic expression. Refusing the wave of nationalism to pass them by, Breton composers began to assert their cultural identity by reviving ancient, modal Church canticles, folk melodies and traditionally Celtic instruments. As the tonal matrices of French post-Romanticism congealed into Impressionism, Breton musical Romanticism and Impressionism also entered the foreground of French musical life. By 1910, *l'Association des compositeurs bretons* was founded by *Les Huit* (Louis Aubert, Charles-Augustin Collin, Maurice Duhamel, Paul Ladmirault, Paul Le Flem, Paul Martineau, Joseph-Guy Ropartz, and Louis Vuillemin). Affectionately nicknamed *La Cohorte bretonne* ("The Invading Breton Troop") by critic René Dumesnil, the Association commissioned and launched Breton and Breton-inspired compositions in the national capital until the outbreak of World War I. After the Great War, Paris' greatest fear for the security of the Republic was the festering autonomist movement in Alsace, just regained after the Armistice. In extenso, Breton autonomist movements also presented a threat, and this led to further, violently repressive measures outlawing the speaking of the Breton language and the holding of Mass in Breton. Fearing that the impetus provided the cultural faction of *Le Mouvement breton* would wane, and coinciding with Maurice Duhamel's political address to the Bretons at the *Congrès breton* of 1929, Paul Ladmirault composed his own cultural epistle to Breton artists, *L’Exemple des Cinq Russes* in 1928. Ladmirault heralded the province's cultural originality and independence and aligned her struggles for recognition with those of the Russian musical nationalists, The Mighty Five (Mili Balakirev, Alexander Borodin, César Cui, Modeste Moussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov), a generation earlier. Seeing that this movement had, after a half century, finally earned its rightful place within the musical Pantheon, Breton composers finally found the requisite impetus to develop their own, distinct cultural patrimony.
Throughout western musical history, folk music has consistently intertwined with both sacred and secular art music. Rare is the composer who, wittingly or unwittingly, has not drawn from his or from other nations’ folk songs. Dependent upon this heritage, and through variegated states and levels of inspiration, he evolved prismatic dimensions of his originality. The intent of this essay is to introduce the arcane artistic roots and historico-political nature of musical nationalism in Brittany,1 and how eight Breton composers of the Impressionist era, inspired by five indefatigable Russian colleagues, rose to develop and affirm their own strain of post-Romanticism as an artistic manifesto in its own right.

As the Age of Enlightenment gave way to Romanticism, the concept of the human being as a worthy individual, finally unfettered by the shackles and vestiges of feudalism, began to filter through the collective consciousness of many, if not most, Europeans. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that the words patrie, personnalité and optimisme first appeared in the official French Dictionary in 1777, a dozen years before the French Revolution.2 From this personalization of the individual followed the transmission and subsequent sophistication of his folk songs. To the unending consternation of the nobility and the clergy, human rights and freedoms came not only to be espoused but celebrated on public stages. Plays and operas, notably those of (Pierre-Augustin Caron de) Beaumarchais (1732-99; Le Mariage de Figaro, 1778) and Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805, Wallenstein, 1798-99), Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756-91; Le Nozze di Figaro, 1787; Don Giovanni, 1787; Die Zauberflöte, 1791), Carl Maria von Weber (1786-1826, Der Freischütz, 1821) and Ludwig van Beethoven (1770-1827, Fidelio, 1805), liberally propounded themes of égalité, fraternité and liberté into and throughout the Romantic era. Parallel to these concepts, filtering their way into the collective European psyche, evolved a heightened awareness of individuality or uniqueness through nationalism, arguably the most successful political force of the nineteenth century and beyond.

French nationalism after the Revolution evolved as a syndrome of citizenry and “inclusion,” chiefly by coercion. Towards 1790, less than half of what is understood today as the French Republic spoke classical French, and, for all intents and purposes, the new French state quite simply forbade, at the administrative and educational levels, languages other than French. As the nineteenth century progressed, this policy was enforced at times through excessive violence. In Germany, the concept of the “nation” was defined along ethnic lines as a matter of political convenience. Over the centuries, German had become the lingua franca for much of the middle classes of Central and Eastern Europe, whereas French remained the intellectual language of the Court and of diplomacy, dominating as such until the 1960s. Since so many across the Continent were native German speakers, the most logical way to identify people was through their nationality.

At its root, the phenomenon of nationalism is essentially a romantic notion. And Romanticism, according to most social historians and psychologists, is a function of the ego, a manifestation of the self. It is only logical, therefore that the efflorescence of the Romantic movement, or Romantic spirit, was so rapid. This post-Revolutionary emancipation gave way to self-expression and then to self-absorption, leading eventually to what many consider to be the extravagant emotional excesses of post-Romanticism, as exemplified by the superstructural symphonic exaltations of Gustav Mahler (1860-1911). Whether post-Romanticism and its excesses began with the watershed year 1848, when major social upheavals and political revolutions stirred Europe in tandem, is debatable. But there is no doubt that by this year, concept of the nation, the nation-state, and the right of the individual to acculturate in the language and cultural timbres of his patrimony, had become viewed as sacrosanct. And the most palpable of these were his language and folk songs.

---

1The ancient name for Brittany, still used in contemporary spoken and written French, is Armor (l’Armor, or l’Armorique, in French), and means “against the sea”; more rarely used is l’Arror.
As the Romantic century advanced, truer, more intellectualized understandings and representations of Europe’s minorities developed. They became popularized through the numerous World’s Fairs which began to regularly punctuate the Continent’s collective cultural agenda. Incontrovertible is that the dissemination of such determinant, vibrant political philosophies as Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s, Johann Gottfried Herder’s (1744-1803) and Johann Gottlieb Fichte’s (1762-1814) and Johann Gottfried Herder’s (1744-1803) had empowered the “grass roots” cultural movements. Otherwise, hosts of European minority cultures would have disappeared within the larger linguistic and cultural melting pots. Personal expression was, and essentially remains the microcosm of nationalistic expression. Through philosophical tracts such as Schiller’s Über die aesthetische Erziehung der Menschen in einer Reihe von Briefen (“On the Aesthetic Education of Man, in a Series of Letters,” 1795), Rousseau’s Du contrat social (“The Social Contract,” 1762) Johann Gottfried Herder’s Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache (“On the Origin of Language,” 1772) and Johann Gottlieb Fichte’s Reden an die deutsche Nation (“Addresses to the German Nation,” 1808), and sought to inspire pride not only in German language and culture but also in its regional variants; his edicts became widely disseminated and read by many a leader of the nationalistic rebellions of the nineteenth century, both peaceful and violent. As an example, one of many such dialects, Sorbian, or Wendish, spoken by a little-known nationality within the larger German cultural entity, survived. The Sorbs, or Wends, still inhabit a corner of southeastern Germany, bordering on the Bohemian region of the current Czech Republic. Their language is Slavic, naturally suffused with regional Germanicisms and, for all intents and purposes, was saved by the philosophical writings of the times. Major composers became fascinated by such minorities, studied their folk songs avidly, and the Wends have no less a composer to thank for the attention drawn to their heritage than Johannes Brahms (1833-97). Brahms continually studied the folk tales and folk songs of many European minorities. These so impressed the composer that he transformed a number of their melodies into art songs and set their poems to music, incorporating them into that special pantheon of German musical form, the Lied, or art song. In Von ewiger Liebe (“Of Eternal Love”), Op. 43, #1, Brahms set a Wendish folk song to words by poet and librettist Josef Wenzig (1807-76); this became one of his most beloved songs and a staple of the singer’s recital repertory. Many music historians will argue that by the time Brahms set both German and other folk melodies, this had become de rigueur, an older version of political correctness. After all, had Beethoven, the German, not written Eossais (“Scottish Dances”), and arranged dozens of Irish, Scottish and Welsh folk songs? Had not the Hungarian Franz (Ferenč) Liszt (1811-86) interspersed his output with Hungarian (inter alia) Rhapsodies? Indeed. Yet, these were sanitized, inspired reproductions. Beethoven had never set foot in the British Isles, and Liszt, who hardly spoke Hungarian after the age of ten, spent most of his life outside his native Hungary dutifully acting Hungarian. It would be left to Béla Bartók (1881-1945) and to Zoltán Kodály (1882-1967) to roam the countryside of Central Europe and the Balkans and codify indigenous melody from its very essence: the oral tradition.

Where Brittany is concerned, the task of collecting and archiving folk songs had already begun with the Breton aristocrat, ethnographer and ethnolinguist Baron Hersart de La Villemarqué (1815-95). In 1839, he released Barzaz Breiz (“Songs and Ballads of Brittany”), its success extraordinary. For the first time in memory, the folkloric heritage of France’s strategically exploited and culturally ignored western province, annexed since 1532, enjoyed the attention of Europe’s illuminati, at times even eclipsing the rest of France. For it was not until in 1852, under the Décret [Hippolyte] Fortoul (1811-56), Minister of Education and Religion (1851-56) under the Second Empire of Napoléon III (1808-73), that such endeavors finally gained government sanction through the reforms provided by this decree. Fortoul’s decree was essentially moot for the Bretons who, as early as 1805, had begun exploiting such opportunities in accordance with Napoléon I’s (1769-21) newly-sanctioned Académie celtoïque, created chiefly to assuage tensions between Brittany and the French Republic. This institute empowered Breton intellectuals to continue research on and disseminate information about their homeland. By the time La Villemarqué released his tome, much of Europe had for decades been enveloped by a Celtic Renaissance. Barzaz Breiz’s success was instantaneous, its dissemination immediate, and within a year, its author was crowned a Celtic Bard at the Abergavenny Eisteddfod in Wales. Although the expediency of this phenomenon has surprised many, it is our contention that this consequence was inevitable, and

---

intimately tied to the visceral nature of Breton nationalism. Since its annexation by France, the province had lived and prospered within an uneasy union. With the Revolution of 1789, however, came the centralization of powers in the national capital and the state-sanctioned repression of regional languages. The ethos of centralism had quickly permeated the collective psyche. Yet almost inexplicably, a very negative image of the Breton evolved. Its gradual post-1793 rediscovery presented an intellectual dynamic broad enough to disconcert or disorient even the most erudite, and this is in part attributable to Victor Hugo’s (1802-1885) fulminations on the Armorican province. In his novel *Ninety-Three*, Hugo encapsulated the great divide between the Breton ethos and the “new” France with a pronounced measure of condescension. Written in 1874, Hugo set his stage during Revolutionary times and, in his habitually generous verbiage, opined that:

If one wishes to understand the [neighbouring] Vendée [this region was site of some of the bloodiest resistance], one should consider [and juxtapose] the source[s] of this antagonism: on the one hand, the French Revolution, on the other, the Breton peasant. Confronted by this incomparable event, this enormous, spontaneous threat to every blessing of history, the eruption of a civilization’s collective anger, the inexorable thrust of progress, the disproportionate, [nearly] mindless [hunger for] improvement, one should [try to] situate this sullen and singular [primitive] brute, this long-haired creature with light eyes, who survives on milk and chestnuts, who limits himself to a thatch-roofed house, to his hedges and his ditches; a man able to recognize every neighboring hamlet by the sound of its churchbell, who uses water only for [the purpose of] drinking [it], who wears a leather jacket decorated with silk arabesques; an ignoramus adorned by embroidered garments, who tatoos his clothes [just] as his ancestors the Celts had tatooed their faces, who fears his master as though he were his executioner, speaks a dead language – which to plant a gravestone upon one’s thinking; who goads his cattle, sharpens his scythe, harvests his buckwheat [and then] kneads [the batter for] his buckwheat pancake; a man who venerates first his plough, then his grandmother, believes in the Virgin Mary and in the White Lady; a devotee as much of the altar as of the tall, mysterious [pre-historic] stones [standing] adroit in the middle of a moor [see author’s note]; a field labourer; a coastal fisherman; a poacher of the thickets; a man fond of his kings, his overlords, his priests, [and even] his fleas; [a man] pensive, immobile, transfixed for hours on end by endless, deserted beaches, his melancholic ear attuned to [the rumblings of] the sea. And one wonders if such a [narrow] individual, [intellectually as] blind [as a bat] could ever see [much less accept] such clarity [of thought] ...4

Victims of such disdain, and fully conscious of the longevity and richness of their patrimony, it was only natural that Bretons rose to defend it. Such reaction has been lucidly explained by Bartók:

It is incontestable that the reasons for [the rush to] compile popular songs and to study popular art in general stem from the awakening of nationalist sentiment.... As for minorities, principally those living under an oppressive political régime, they discovered, within this ethos, a sort of consolation which substantiated their national consciousness; study and pub-

---

4 Si l’on veut comprendre la Vendée, qu’on se figure cet antagonisme: d’un côté, la Révolution française, de l’autre le paysan breton. En face de ces événements incomparables, menace immense de tous les bienfaits à la fois, accès de colère de la civilisation, excès du progrès, amélioration démesurée et inintelligente, qu’on place ce sauvage grave et singulier, cet homme à l’oeil clair et aux longs cheveux, vivant de lait et de châtaignes, borné à son toit de chaume, à sa haie et à son fossé, distinguant chaque hameau du voisinage au son de sa cloche, ne se servant de l’eau que pour boire, ayant sur le dos une veste de cuir avec des arabesques de soie, inculte et broude, tatouant ses habits comme ses ancêtres les Celtes avaient tatoué leurs visages, respectant son maître dans son bourreau, parlant une langue morte, ce qui est faire habiter une tombe à sa pensée, piquant ses bouffées, aiguisant sa faucille, serrant son blé noir, pétrissant sa galette de sarrasin, vénérant sa charme d’abord, sa grand-mère ensuite, érayant à la Sainte Vierge et à la Dame Blanche, dévot à l’autel et aussi à la haute pierre mystérieuse debout au milieu de la lande, laboureur dans la plaine, pêcheur sur la côte, bracconnier dans le ballier, aimant ses rois, ses seigneurs, ses prêtres, ses poux; pensif, immobile, souvent des heures entières sur la grande grève déserte, sombre écouteur de la mer. Et qu’on se demande si cet aveugle pouvait accepter cette clarté... Victor Hugo, *Quatrevingt-Treize*, Paris: Gallimard, 1979, p. 232-33. [Note: The tall stones to which Hugo naively refers are most probably the prehistoric megaliths aligned along the Atlantic coastline of the Morbihan district of Brittany, specifically at Carnac. These are known as *les alignements de Carnac*.]
lication of their folkloric treasures was a way to repair the outrage which oppression had inflicted upon the social strata [which had long-been established].

Dr. Philippe Gonin, in his recent, remarkable dissertation on the Breton composer Paul Le Flem (1881-1984), one of the founders of the New Breton School to be discussed in this essay, affirms the reasons for which Bretons rushed to defend their culture: “Among the French provinces that generously disseminate their popular riches, Brittany is without doubt one of the best-explored.” This is further substantiated by the distinguished scholar, Michel Faure:

Doubtless, among the folklore of our Hexagonal nation, the Breton is the best-preserved. The isolation of the Armorican peninsula and the longevity of the Breton idiom provide that part of the France of yesteryear endures at the very tip of our territory, at least until the end of the nineteenth century. To travel to Brittany is to return to by-gone days.

Should one indeed consider the individual to be a microcosm of his national identity, then the greatest kudos for conscious, laborious efforts toward national cultural affirmation must be awarded to an impassioned group of mid-nineteenth century Russians known as “The Mighty Five”: Mily Balakirev (1837-1910), Alexander Borodin (1833-1887), César Cui (1835-1918), Modeste Moussorgsky (1838-1881) and Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov (1844-1908), whose “New Russian School” eventually revolutionized compositional procedure in Russia. In time, theirs evolved into one of the most significant movements of modern musical history, catalytic to the transformation of romantic into veristic opera and to preserving the integrity of folk melody.

The concept of a national school came relatively late to the Russians. Due in part to the German ancestry and heritage of its monarchs, Imperial Russia had for centuries looked westward and never east- or southward for cultural enrichment. Scientists, architects, engineers, philosophers, literati, and musicians from France, Italy, Germany, Holland and England constituted a vital presence throughout aristocratic Russia. Every self-respecting court, at every level of the monarchy, prided itself on having foreign tutors and resident artists of every Western stripe. By the turn of the nineteenth century, few, if any important court musicians were Russian. The little Russian opera that existed derived from Italian models, ballet from France, art song and choral music essentially from the German tradition, and instrumental music from both the French and German traditions. The result was such that very little of Russian’s musical life had evolved along national or regional aesthetic lines, with the possible of the Znamenny chant. It is only natural, therefore, that this vast country, with its power centered in a small, recondite corner of northeastern Europe, with its many nationalities, ethnicities, religions, musics and cultures, had been awakened quite late to the pan-Slavic and Austro-Slavic nationalist movements which emerged from the popular revolutions of 1848. The New Russian School of St. Petersburg became the chief rival of its traditionalist counterpart gracing the hallowed halls of the Moscow Conservatory, whose most important composition professors were Nikolai Grigoryevich Rubinstein (1835-81), and Piotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky (1840-93). Despite the fact that both had happily incorporated Russian folk melodies into their works, the St. Petersburg upstarts considered them to be slaves to the older, Western aesthetic that they believed had corrupted the purity of Russian melodies by setting them to tradi-

---

5 Il est incontestable que le mobile de la collecte des chansons populaires, et, en général, de toute étude sur l’art populaire, doit être cherché dans l’éveil du sentiment national... Quant aux petites nations, principalement celles qui vivaient sous un régime d’oppression politique, elles trouvaient là une espèce de consolation qui raffermissait leur conscience nationale ; l’étude et la publication des trésors du folklore étaient un moyen de réparer les outrages que l’oppression infligait au sentiment national des couches cultivées. Béla Bartók, “Recherche folklorique et nationalisme,” in Bartók, sa vie et son oeuvre. Budapest: Corvina, 1956, p. 188.


tional harmonic schemes. In fact, the Muscovite intelligentsia had initially labelled The Five “just a little heap of musicians,” to which their champion, the distinguished critic Vladimir Vasilyevich Stasov (1824-1906) retorted: “but how mighty a heap!” It was from this interchange that their nickname “The Mighty Five” emerged.

The idealism, verve and innovative work of their revered mentors, the godfathers of the Russian nationalist movement in music, Mikhail Glinka (1804-57) and Alexandr Dargomizhsky (1813-69), proved insufficient for the Mighty Five. Glinka’s two operas, which he punctuated with more “ethnicized” folk song settings, also deployed distinctly nationalistic themes: A Life for the Tsar (1836), and Ruslan and Ludmilla (1842) became the cornerstones of Russian opera. Stasov summarized the beginnings of the Russian School as follows:

A primary factor was open-mindedness – the absence of preconceptions and blind faith. Since its very inception, with Glinka, the Russian school as been marked by complete independence in its views and attitudes towards the music of the past. It has never accepted without question the judgements of ‘recognized authorities,’ but has insisted upon verifying everything for itself, on determining for itself whether or not a composer is great and his works important. While such independence of thought is found all to rarely among European musicians even today, it was still rarer fifty years ago. Only a handful of them – men like [Robert Alexander] Schumann [1810-54], for example – dared to apply their own critical judgement of the established idols. Most musicians in the West blindly accept all the opinions of the authorities and share all the tastes and prejudices of the crowd. The new Russian musicians, on the other hand, are dreadfully ‘irreverent’. They view traditional attitudes with scepticism and will not value anything they are supposed to until they themselves are persuaded of its worth.9

For Glinka’s was a reaction against what he perceived to be the contamination of Russian music by the artifice and superficiality of Italian opera and the rigidity of German theoretical training. (His own composition teacher, Siegfried Dehn (1799-1858), was German.) None the less, the Mighty Five considered their forebears to be only a good start towards the purification of Russian music. They had had enough of the ridicule to which their nation’s culture had been perpetually subjected by their overlords, and were also duly emboldened by the subsidy of foreign artists on their own soil, at the expense of Russian culture.

Consequently, the artistic soul-searching that marked the Russian musical mind was both logical and timely, not to mention unending, as Stasov further, and deftly, explains:

Another important distinguishing feature of our school is its constant search for national character. This began with Glinka and has continued uninterruptedly until the present time. No such striving is to be found in any other European school of composition. The historical and cultural conditions of other peoples have been such that folk song – that expression of the simple, spontaneous musicality of the people – has long since all but disappeared in most civilized countries. In the nineteenth century, who knows or ever hears French, German, Italian or English folk songs? There were such songs, of course, and they were once widely sung, but there were moved down by the levelling scythe of European culture, which is so inimical to all folk art and customs, and nowadays it requires the efforts of musical archeologists and curious travellers to unearth remnants of them in remote corners of the provinces. In our country it is a completely different matter. Folk songs are heard everywhere even today. Every muzhik, carpenter, bricklayer, doorkeeper, cabman; every peasant woman, laundry-maid and cook, every nurse and wet-nurse – all bring the folk songs of their villages with them to Petersburg, Moscow, to each and every city, and we hear them the whole year.

round. We are constantly surrounded by them. Every working man and woman in Russia sings endlessly while working, just as their ancestors did a thousand years ago. The Russian soldier goes into battle with a folk song on his lips. These songs are a part of each and every one of us; we need no archeologists to unearth them so that we may come to know and love them. This being the case, every musically gifted Russian is surrounded from the day of his birth, by a truly national music. Moreover, it so happens that almost all of the most important Russian composers, Glinka, Dargomizhsky, Mussorgsky, Balakirev and Rimsky-Korsakov – were born, not in the capitals, but in the provincial towns or on their fathers’ estates and they spent all their early years there. The others also spent much of their youth in the provinces, in frequent and close contact with folk songs and folk-singing. Their and most deep-seated musical impressions were derived from folk song. The fact that we were so long in producing art music of our own was due solely to the unfavorable conditions of Russian life in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when everything national was trampled in the mud. Nevertheless, the need for a national music was so basic and widespread that even during the time of Catherine the Great, a time of courtiers and powdered wigs, one of our composers after another tried to incorporate folk melodies into his poor operas, which were patterned on the poor European operas of the day.10

With Cesar Cui as its impassioned polemicist and the rest of the movement’s impassioned artistes-provocateurs, the Mighty Five set out to codify a strict system of rules to identify, authenticate and reproduce Russian folk song as accurately as possible from the oral tradition. Following ethnological and philological principles, Slavonic (Orthodox) church modes were to be revived, the accents of the vernaculars respected, inflections of speech reproduced as lucidly as possible through melody, and melody itself governed by the ancient modes, and not by the rules of contemporaneous Western harmonic practice; legends, tales, regional and national issues, current and historic, were to make up the fabric of opera and program music. Within the Slavic world, the doctrine of the Mighty Five was heralded loudest and most systematically applied by the Moravian Leo Janie (1854-1928). For his eristic operas, notably Jennifer (1904), the staunch individualist devised his own system of vocal notation so as to assure as accurately as possible the speech patterns and inflections of his native dialect of Czech, as spoken in the southwest Latina region of Moravia. This technique came to be called Sprachmelodie, or “speech melody,” and differs fundamentally from Arnold Schoenberg’s (1874-1951) Sprechstimme technique, where, as in his Pierrot Lunaire, Opus 21 (1912), in which speech is mimicked, and from Wagner’s technique, Sprechgesang, by which the voice intermingles as though a part of the orchestra.

France’s charge to nationalism would be led by Camille Saint-Saëns (1835-1921), who, in 1871, founded the Société Nationale de Musique, after the German conquest of 1870. Its quixotic goal would be the “de-Wagnerization” of French music. Quixotic because at that time, the tonal language most readily identifiable as French, Impressionism, yet to be “officially” countenanced and eventually represented by its fundamental idiom, the whole-tone scale, had not yet assumed its rightful place within the collective musical conscience. What most French musicians came to consider as truly French amounted to a blatant refutation of anything remotely attributable to German musical concepts: large-scale forms, adherence to the strictures of form, harmony, counterpoint, and, generally speaking, cumbersome, heavy orchestrations. The dilemma was both unending and unyielding. Supposedly to heal France’s Wagnerian wounds and allegedly resulting cultural fragmentation, pseudo-intellectual diatribes, launched almost officially by a zealous coterie of right-wing, politically savvy and influential, anti-Semitic cultural mavens led by Vincent d’Indy (1851-1931), attempted to officially codify, and even regulate so-called French attributes of musical composition. The legacy of Minister Fortnum’s decree of 1852 was such that folk songs, folk tales and folk poetry became the domain and property of official regulatory bodies in Paris. Consequently, the only way a non-Parisian composer could thrive was through some sort of official approbation, or even vindication, in certain cases. Officially “great” training was to be experienced at the Paris Conservatoire or the Schola Cantorum; officially great ideas came to light, of course, at the Sorbonne. The legacy of Richard Wagner’s (1811-83) Gesamtkunstwerk, artfully and

10Ibid., p. 71.
dutifully condemned by Saint-Saëns in his 1916 epistle *Germanophilie*, was among the first victims of the ethos of Gallic cultural puritanism, despite the fact that virtually all the “powers that were” had been pious pilgrims to Bayreuth. To quote Henri Duparc (1848-1933), France’s undisputed master composer of art song:

> We French musicians, we are far from being well enough acquainted with the popular music of our [own] country... We are but false Germans, because the serious musicians [of our nation] have been trained in the study and admiration of German masterpieces, without even knowing the marvelous songs of our French provinces, which would have offered us a French musical soul.12

This dilemma concerned the Breton composer little, preoccupied as he was with the Breton and not the French musical soul. None the less, how, might one ask, did the *gestalt* of the Mighty Five manage its way into France, and then enter the psyche of the Breton composer, who felt his identity to be have been subjugated to even more trampling than that of his Russian counterpart? For if the sweep of nationalism had come late to Mother Russia, it emerged even later in Brittany, naturally by way of official Paris.

Surprisingly, centralization did have its positive side. Jealously guarding its stature, the national capital organized important World’s Fairs (Expositions universelles) in 1855, 1867, 1878, 1889 and 1900. These provided French artists and musicians with vistas hence unknown to them and, by extension, an immense fount of inspiration. After the Franco-Prussian War, economic and cultural exchanges between France and Russia, acting in part as a political counterbalance to Germany, were greatly encouraged by Paris, and quickly flourished. A treaty of friendship came into effect in 1891 and, among myriad cultural, professional, economic and political organizations, a number of Franco-Russian musical associations evolved. These provided performance opportunities for Russian composers in Europe’s artistic capital, Paris. The crowning glory and testament to Franco-Russian friendship came with Tsar Nicholas’ (1868-1918) and Tsarina Alexandra’s (1872-1918) state visit in 1896: on October 7th, together with Président Félix Faure (1841-99), they laid the cornerstones of the Alexander III Bridge (Pont Alexandre III), in memory of the Tsar’s father. Paris’s most beautiful bridge would be completed in honor of the 1900 World’s Fair.

Whereas this overture to the West presented enormous opportunities for the Russian artist, the eastward glance was nothing new for his French counterpart. Inspired by their discoveries at the earlier Expositions universelles, many French and Breton composers, among them Claude Debussy (1862-1918) and Paul Ladmirault (1877-1944), had travelled to and worked in Russia. Beyond these considerations, however, the most potent intellectual forces driving French and Breton nationalism were the lectures on Russian music at the Paris Conservatoire by the distinguished Breton ethnographer, musicologist and theorist, Louis-Albert Bourgault-Ducoudray (1840-1910), whose influence was fundamental to the establishment of the New Breton School.13 Even more potent were the impassioned writings of César Cui. As his father was French, he was as fluent in the language of (Jean-Marie Arouet de) Voltaire (1694-1778) as he was in that of (Alexander) Pushkin (1799-1837). Writing in both French and Russian since the 1860s, this brilliant polemicist’s articles and reviews explored and explained the nature of “the people’s music,” in its historical, societal and technical understanding. These had been disseminated systematically across the French artistic press which, towards the turn of the twentieth century, had developed into an arsenal of nearly twenty daily, weekly and monthly publications that devoted considerable critical space to music; a healthy number of these were dedicated musical publications. In 1880, the importance of César Cui’s findings was substantiated by the distinguished Parisian publisher Fischbacher, who released many of them as a collection of essays entitled *La Musique en Russie*.

---

12Nous autres musiciens français, nous sommes loin de connaître assez la musique populaire de notre pays... Nous ne sommes que de faux Allemands, parce que nos vrais musiciens ont été élevés dans l'étude et l'admiration des chefs-d'oeuvres allemands, sans même connaître les merveilleux chants de nos provinces françaises, qui nous auraient fait une âme musicale française. Unpublished letter of 15 June 1903 to Jean Cras. Courtesy of Mlle Monique Cras.
Just as the Russians and the French had banded together to assert their national identity, so did the Bretons who, better late than never, rose to the challenge in 1912. What finally emerged was the *Association des Compositeurs bretons*, founded that year by Bretons living both in the homeland and in Paris. The co-founders were the ultra-nationalists Maurice Duhamel (1884-1940) and Paul Martineau (1890-1915), from Nantes; they were joined by Paul Ladmirault and Louis Vuillemin (1879-1929), also born in Nantes, Charles-Augustin Collin (1867-1952), from Saint-Brieuc (Côtes-d’Armor), Louis Aubert (1877-1968), from Paramé, near Saint-Malo (Ille-et-Vilaine), Paul Le Flem (1881-1984), from Lézardrieux (Côtes-d’Armor), and Joseph-Guy Ropartz (1864-1955), born in Guingamp (Côtes-d’Armor). The Russian Five, to cite both Maurice Duhamel and Paul Ladmirault *exactly*, were to serve as their role models. Readily available to Bretons were three creative outlets. The first, obviously, were the folk songs, so many of which had become intertwined with the province’s church music. Recalling that Brittany has always been and still is the most pious region of France, the proliferation of sacred works for all purposes and for all combinations of instruments and voices was inevitable. In the process, the glorious, ancient Breton canticles, with their characteristic, irregular metres, jagged rhythmic structures and original melodic modes, sacred symbols of the Breton soul, became exploited to the fullest. Jointly, a highly acclaimed school of organ playing emerged, grounded in the legacy of Pierre Thielemans (born in Brussels in 1825 and died in Guingamp (Côtes-d’Armor) in 1898). Here as well, creators drew from the canticles. In the secular realm, Breton composers of the late nineteenth century, much like the three generations of literati before them, drew their inspiration from the province’s extraordinarily rich historical and mythological legacies. As though working in tandem with these traditions, the most recognized, populist emblems of Breton music reentered the arena: the native instruments themselves. These reflections of Breton antiquity, the Celtic harp, the *bombarde-biniou* (bagpipe and shawm) coupling, and the family of Breton, or Celtic fiddles, enabled composers to develop idiosyncratic adaptations, interpretations and permutations of sound and color: metaphoric, auditory nuances, transfused and suffused into the classical instrumental or symphonic discourse. Ultimately, from this cultural birthright sprung forth a tremendous repertory for the harp, exploited by virtually every Breton composer until this day, a literature which both focuses on and subtly evokes the Celtic muse. The Bretons adopted the same guiding principles as had the Russians: melodic line was to reflect as closely as possible the timbre, range, intonation and original modality of a folk melody; rhythm and metre would accommodate textual flow and poetic rhythm; nationalistic expression would, quite naturally, differ, and would be drawn from Brittany’s lengthy history, her pagan and Christian spirituality, and, ideally, mirror her Celtic and pagan mythology. Settings of similar folk melodies would be justifiably altered according to regional variances: to quote the renowned scholar of Russian music, Gerald Abraham (1904-88), “They were artists, not archeologists.”

To avoid any confusion with *Les Six*, Georges Auric (1899-1983), Louis Durey (1888-1979), Arthur Honegger (1892-1955), Germaine Tailleferre (1892-1983), Darius Milhaud (1892-1974) and Francis Poulenc (1899-1963), a distinguished group of eager upstarts petulantly protesting the pompous musical orders of their day, Wagnerism and Impressionism, the founding members of *l’Association des compositeurs bretons* may henceforth be known in French as *Les Huit*, or *La Cohorte bretonne*, or, in English as “The (Breton) Eight,” or “The (Breton) Cohorts”. I would opt for the simplest, *Les Huit*. Whereas *Les Six* presented themselves as gentle rebels, *Les Huit* never hesitated to depict their cause as anything less than political or polemical. The most ardently nationalistic among them were Maurice Duhamel, Paul Martineau and Paul Ladmirault, and may well be considered the movement’s political arm.

---

14 There appears to be some confusion as to the founding date of this movement. Both Véfa de Bellaing, in her *Dictionnaire des compositeurs de musique en Bretagne* (Nantes: Ouest, 1992) and Luc Legear, author of numerous biographical studies of Breton composers for *Résonances*, published by *Musique et danse en Bretagne* at Châteaugiron, consistently claim 1912, whereas, in his dissertation (p. 346), Philippe Gonin offers 1910-11 as the year during which the *Association* was founded.


Although Martineau hailed from Western Brittany, French was his mother tongue. Nonetheless, he learned Breton so as to interact professionally with native Breton-speaking colleagues. Martineau saw himself as a unifying figure between French and Breton cultures, and sought to purge Breton classical music of excessive binioseries, a contemporaneous euphemism that served to specify the overuse of the Celtic instruments in art music. To quote the composer:

I conceive my compositions in the following way: to make them more Breton than has ever been done, than shall ever be, and at the same time afford it universal [appeal]. To hail from only one country [homeland], or to have none [at all], are two [distinct] impoverishments.17

Martineau’s stated goal was to develop his musical ideas “Celtically,” rather than to develop Celtic ideas musically, which is what the Mighty Five had accused Tchaikovsky of doing.18 He portrayed this principle through his Petite suite sur des airs populaires nantais (“Little Suite on Themes from Nantes”), published posthumously in 1919. Barely 25 at the time of his death, the impassioned, immensely gifted Martineau saw few of his compositions materialize. His passing on was bitterly regretted and represented a tragic loss to the evolution of Brittany’s classical music.

In 1888, while Bourgault-Ducoudray was combing the Breton countryside for indigenous folk songs, he discovered the eleven year-old Paul Ladmirault’s talent, became his mentor and brought him into the Paris Conservatoire. However academically French this training was, Ladmirault remained staunchly Breton and composed as such. In 1905, Gabriel Fauré (1845-1924) and Maurice Ravel (1875-1937) publicly voiced their admiration for his Suite bretonne, and in 1909, his tone poem Brocéliande au matin (“Morning in [the Forest of] Brocéliande,” 1909) was launched at the Société Nationale in Paris with great success. Ladmirault was a member of Nantes’s Cercle breton, which rewarded his contributions to Breton culture by nominating him as a Druid at the Gorsedd de Bretagne in 1908;19 here he took on the name Oriav (Oriaw). He went on to produce ballets such as La Prêtresse de Korydwen (“The Priestess of Korydwen”), stage music entitled Tristan et Iseut (1918), and in 1921, completed his opera Myrdin (“Merlin”). He demonstrated his devotion to all Celtic music through his Rhapsodie gaëlique (1909), for piano four hands. In 1928, he took on the Directorship of Kornog (“The West”), an innovative interdisciplinary bilingual journal. He would write that: “If Brittany’s [political] autonomy has managed to ignite the flames of self-interest and the passions of indignation on the one hand, in contrast, her artistic independence cannot [possibly] be contested.”20

Louis Vuillemin (1879-1929) bequeathed a legacy of works celebrating Brittany’s history and culture. From his adopted Parisian residence, Vuillemin served as a vital link to the French cultural establishment. His compositions disclose a distinctly Breton and Celtic agenda, of which a popular, seven-movement suite entitled En Kernéo (“En Cournouailles, or “In Cornwall,” 1922),21 for piano four hands, is but one. Its orchestration, also by Vuillemin, increased the work’s popularity immensely due to its remarkable evocations of the Celtic instruments. Louis Vuillemin gained as much acclaim as musicologist and as journalist. As chief critic for Comoedia, Chantecler, Le Courrier musical, Paris-Soir and La Lanterne for many years, he was one of the first to discover Maurice Ravel (1875-1937).

---

18Loc. cit.
19A Gorsedd (pronounced “gorseth”) is a reunion of bards. The term Gorsedd (literally ‘high seat’) originally referred to prehistoric sacred mounds, often with single trees growing on them, which were places of assembly for festival celebration, law-giving, and the inauguration of kings.
21Brittany also includes a region called Cournouailles, or Cornwall, as in the United Kingdom.
To Louis Aubert we owe a symphonic poem entitled *Le Tombeau de Chateaubriand* (“The Tomb of Chateaubriand” (1768-1848)), composed in 1948 to commemorate the centenary of the great author-philosopher-politician’s death. Both hailed from Saint-Malo (Ille-et-Vilaine). Aubert also trained at the Paris Conservatoire, working with Fauré in composition and with Louis Diémer (1843-1919) in piano, proving himself to be a superb pianist. His fairy-tale opera *La Forêt bleue* (“The Blue Forest”), begun in 1904, was ignored for years by the Parisian establishment until it premiered in Geneva in 1907. Under André Caplet’s (1878-1925) baton at the Boston Opera in 1913, Aubert’s opera, which animates several of Charles Perrault’s (1628-1703) fairy tales (1697), became a classic in the repertoire for children. Esteemed by the greatest figures of his generation, Louis Aubert is the proud dedicatee of Ravel’s *Valses nobles et sentimentales* (1911).

Charles-Auguste Collin hailed from a venerated family of organists and organ builders. He studied at the *Ecole Niedermeyer* from 1879-84, and the organ with César Franck (1822-90), a close friend of his father’s. With his brother Sullian (1867-1952), he founded the Breton musical journal *Le Sonneur de Bretagne* (approximately translated as “The Breton Musician”) in 1892. A superb orator, he lectured on Breton sacred music throughout the province and in Paris as well, focussing particularly on the relationship of Gregorian modality to Breton sacred music. His vast contribution to the organ literature includes a collection of thirty-nine volumes entitled *Ad Altare Dei* (1906) and 120 pieces grouped as *Les Voix mystiques de l’orgue* ("[The] Mystical Voices of the Organ"). He produced numerous sacred and secular Breton-nuanced compositions as well: his cantata for 180 voices, organ and orchestra, *Le Retour au Pays natal* (“[The] Return to the Homeland,” 1914) was composed in 1908 to honor the celebrated Breton poet Villiers de l’Isle-Adam (1839-89).

Without doubt, the deacon of this *nouvel art breton* was Paul Le Flem. Born in 1884, he was able to witness and even guide the flowering of his group’s ideals for nearly a century. A venerated composer, teacher, scholar, critic and humanist, he died in Paris in 1987 at 103. Immersed from birth in the Breton culture through the language and the Church canticles, Le Flem’s artistic proclivities were bound to his roots. Schooled at the Paris Conservatoire and the *Schola Cantorum*, Le Flem’s stated goal was to bridge, and thereby enrich, Breton and French musical tastes. Critics praised him for avoiding an excess of *binionseries supérieures*, meaning that his Breton evocations had not overpowered the strictures of high-brow classical music; doubtless, many Breton composers had failed to achieve this healthy balance. Throughout his life, Paul Le Flem returned to La Villemarqué’s *Barzaz Breiz* for inspiration. In 1938, he began working on an operatic fantasy, *Le Rossignol de Saint-Malo* (“The Nightingale of Saint-Malo”), its story drawn from *Barzaz Breiz*. Here, he abandoned what for him had been the shackles of Debussysist Impressionism to compose bi-tonally. In 1954, during his final creative phase, Le Flem produced another Breton-inspired stage work, *La Magicienne de la mer* (“The Sorceress of the Seas”). Composed in two sections, the first utilizes a text from *Barzaz Breiz* and the second by the composer himself. This work displays the composer’s mastery of the twelve-tone idiom, so distant from the era of his studies, and in dramatic contradistinction to his earlier, more mellifluous creations. Two of Le Flem’s major contributions to the Breton choral tradition include *Le Crépuscule d’Armor* (1908) and *Morven le gaélique* (1963), for five soloists and orchestra; for this work, he set poetry by fellow Breton Max Jacob (1876-1944).

If Paul Le Flem was *Les Huits*’ deacon, then Joseph-Guy Ropartz, born in 1864, was their undisputed dean. At the time of this writing, Ropartz and Jean Cras (1879-1932), from Brest, stand out as the best-known Breton musicians of his generation. Cras, a career navy officer and staunch individualist, refused to partake in any musical society or organization, politely declining the invitation to join *l’Association des compositeurs bretons*. Guy Ropartz gained distinction not only as composer but as one of France’s renowned conductors, organists,

---

22 Published symbolically under his son’s name Perrault d’Armoncour, “Tales of Mother Goose” was released as *Histoires ou contes du temps passé, avec des moralités : Contes de ma mère l’Oye*. None of the stories is original to Perrault; however, their publication gave them legitimacy. Its legacy includes *La Belle au bois dormant* (“Sleeping Beauty”), *Cendrillon* (“Cinderella”), *Barbe-Bleue* (“Bluebeard”), *Le chat botté* (“Puss in Boots”) and *Le petit chaperon rouge* (“Little Red Riding Hood”).

23 *La Bretagne*, 5 May 1942.
poets, pedagogues, theorists, journalists and Conservatoire directors; he also stood cheek by jowl with the great social agitators and even tennis players! Born of a long lineage of Breton intellectuals, his father, Sigismond Ropartz (1823-1878), was a jurist devoted to the welfare of the poor, and was one of Brittany’s most distinguished historians and literati.

The year 1889 was catalytic to the composer. He completed law school, settled in Paris and developed his literary skills in the company of his newly found friends, Ernest Renan (1823-92) and Louis Tiercelin (1849-1915). Later that year, they compiled and published a collection of Breton poetry which they called *Le Parnasse breton contemporain*. This was doubtless the Breton response to Parisian author and critic Catulle Mendès’ (1841-1909) collections of contemporary poetry entitled *Le Parnasse contemporain*. The same year, they founded *L’Hermine*, the first official journal devoted this literature. Ropartz also travelled piously to Bayreuth, and upon studying and hearing numerous operas, fell victim to Wagner’s spell. But this was short-lived. Ropartz’ compositions rarely compromise his Celtic roots, either in name or in deed. Among his early works for the stage are *Fethlène* (1886), based on the life of Saint Patrick, and *Marguerite d’Écosse* (1891). He also composed incidental music to Pierre Loti’s *Pêcheur d’Islande* (1889-91), a novel so dear to Bretons for its heart-breaking depiction of the Breton fisherman’s difficult existence.

From 1894-1919, Ropartz directed the Conservatoire and Concerts de Nancy. As such, he launched over 300 contemporary compositions and revived works dating from even earlier than Bach’s. He would never forget his roots, and expressed his nostalgia for Brittany in a stunning opera, aptly entitled *Le Pays* (“The Homeland,” 1908-10), set to a text by fellow Breton Charles Le Goffic’s (1863-1932) *L’Islandaise*. Here, the fullness of Breton melody and monody are encapsulated into a leitmotif system which never corrupts the native melodic scheme.

Ropartz’s reputation grew steadily, and his works gained recognition on both sides of the Atlantic: the Boston Symphony Orchestra premièred his Fourth Symphony (1910) under André Caplet. By 1919, Ropartz and his family had become prominent members of Nancy society. With Alsace now returned to France, Strasbourg, its capital, needed a new conductor and Conservatoire director. The appointment was offered to Ropartz for reasons as palpably symbolic as musically logical. The government’s choice of a renowned Breton loyal to France for this prestigious position in the volatile, separatist province, was both timely and opportune. Leaving Nancy after so many happy years would be difficult for the Ropartz family. Yet, for the sake of national unity, and to impress upon Bretons that their cultural entity had gained sincere welcome, the composer agreed to replace the celebrated German composer-conductor Hans Pfitzner (1869-1949). Ropartz’ solo violinist in Strasbourg was none other than Charles Munch (1891-1968), future conductor of the Boston Symphony from 1949 to 1962, who came to revere his mentor both as role model and as a second father.

Ropartz worked assiduously in Strasbourg until 1929, when he retired to his family’s manor house in Brittany. He composed tirelessly, releasing compositions devoted to his native homeland and to his country. Among them are the celebrated *Messe en l’honneur de Sainte Anne* (1921), the patron female saint of Brittany, and *Messe en l’honneur de Sainte Odile* (1923), her opposite number in Alsace. In his Saint Anne Mass, Ropartz deploys a Breton canticle in the *Agnus Dei*, and in his Saint Odile Mass he honors the great Alsatian choral tradition. In his beloved *Prélude, Marine et Chansons* (1930), for flute, violin, viola, cello and harp, he draws from a Breton Christmas canticle (*Noël breton*). In 1947, to celebrate the end of World War II, this great Breton composer expressed his French patriotism and abiding humanity through his Fifth Symphony. He died in 1955.

Maurice Duhamel, leader of the pack, was born in Brittany’s ancient capital, Rennes. As President of *l’Association des compositeurs bretons* from its inception, he guided its public profile and stature until the outbreak of World War I. Duhamel was the ultra-nationalist among them, to such a degree that his political career gradually eclipsed his musical one. His own collections of native melodies came to include those of the other Celtic lands, notably the Hebrides. Duhamel’s contribution to the Breton musical movement was consider-

---

24 *Le Parnasse contemporain* was published in Paris by Alphonse Lemerre between 1866-76.

able, especially when he took on the editorial leadership of the French nationalist periodical, *Les Chansons de France* in 1912, and insisted on a healthy, systematic inclusion of Breton folk songs.26 As with the Mighty Five, he held that Breton folk melody hovered naturally over a non-traditional harmonic syntax and that, as such, its proper harmonization had to be modal. This axiom, he correctly applied to Breton folk songs. Duhamel’s collections of Breton folk melody (cited in our bibliography), therefore, stand out as the most authentic of his generation.

The Great War had caused *l’Association des compositeurs bretons* to disband to a large extent. After the Treaty of Versailles, Europe entered into a period of relative but nervous political stability. The disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian, the German and the Ottoman Empires and subsequent creation of smaller, independent nation-states, or states-by-nationality, had essentially affirmed the stature of the minority culture and its eventual entitlement to statehood. The nationalism unfolding in the other Celtic lands, notably Ireland, and the creation of new nation-states, led the Bretons to imagine that an even wider window of cultural autonomy was now opened to them. At the same time, however, the French government felt France’s political unity to be vulnerable. Paris perceived as palpable threats the burgeoning autonomist movements in Alsace, which had been reunited with France at Versailles, and, more so, those in Brittany. Further decrees were pronounced and laws enacted to forbid the use of minority languages throughout the Republic, especially Breton. One must recall here the inflammatory proclamation by the then Minister of Education, Anatole (Pierre Armand) de Monzie (1876-1947), at the opening of the Breton Pavilion at the *Exposition des arts décoratifs* in Paris in 1925, who stated emphatically, that “For the sake of French linguistic unity, the Breton language must disappear!”27 Naturally, this served only to further exacerbate tensions between Brittany and France. Breton clergy and political activists rose to protect the ancient language and to assure its survival. As a sign of protest, musicians spawned additional festivals devoted to their folklore, set out to perform the ancient and modern repertories on the native instruments on a broader scale, and composers, in turn, began creating works evoking Brittany as vividly as possible.

By this time Maurice Duhamel had become very active in the Breton political arena. Throughout his career as ethnographer, composer and critic for *Comoedia* and as first director of *Radio-Rennes*, Maurice Duhamel never ceased to act on behalf of his native province. By 1927, his stellar reputation as music critic earned him an invitation to head the Political Council of the newly formed *Parti autonomiste breton*. Immediately, he began planning the movement’s Second Congress at Châteaulin in 1929. For this major political event, he produced his *modus operandi* for Brittany’s autonomy. This famed address to the French Republic he transformed into a formal declaration, to be examined later in this essay. Duhamel’s goal was a federalist France, founded on the newly-created German model, in which Brittany would enjoy greater linguistic and social freedoms and lesser economic burden to the French Republic.

Also troubled by the reactionary policies unfolding in Paris, Paul Ladmirault used his position and stature as editor-in-chief of *Kornog* to bolster the morale of Breton artists with an article entitled *The Example of ‘The Russian Five.’* Here, he documented their efforts and struggles and principles, and passionately encouraged his fellow Armoricans to follow the prodigious Russian example. His hope was that such writings would reignite nationalist sentiments among his landsmen. Now, then, in translation, follows Paul Ladmirault’s artistic manifesto of 1928, published in the first issue of *Kornog*, *L’Exemple des “Cinq” Russes - Skouer ar “Pemp” Rusiad.*

“Delightful, this strange confidence we feel that [his] maxims, for all their apparent inviolability, can, like Saturn’s hourglass, be turned on their heads!” Thus wrote the humorist Charles Müller [1877-1914], as he commented ironically on certain disputatious aphorisms of La Rochefoucauld [1613-80].


27 *Pour l’unité linguistique de la France, il faut que la langue bretonne disparaisse!* Cited in virtually every reference book or history of Brittany, the full context of this proclamation may be found on the website of the Breton website Gwennhadou.com, le portail 100 Breton: http://www.gwennhadu.com/informer/articles/arsezibreur/ar-seiz-breur.htm
If a mind as great as this can be vulnerable to such mockery, how much more laughable, then, are the pearls of wisdom sagaciously offered by [the] nations! And among these diatribes which once excited Léon Bloy [1846-1917], there is the old wives’ tale that deluded us all the way through childhood: that art knows no national borders.

What could simultaneously be more true or more false? For art consists of two different components: technique and inspiration.

The former obviously crosses all borders, but what of the latter?

Inspiration depends upon the temperaments and characters of our ancestors, their milieu, their eras: that is to say, all matters inextricable from the concept of the homeland [nation].

It is for this reason that the greatest artists have always been those who best reflect the strengths and weaknesses of their [respective] peoples: What could be more North German than the near-massive robustness of a Bach or a Wagner, [or discernable from] the depths and Gemütlichkeit of a Schumann; what could be more South German than the naïve whimsicality of a [Josef] Haydn [1732-1809] or Mozart; more Italian than the theatrical expansivity of a [Gioacchino] Rossini [1792-1868] or a [Giuseppe] Verdi [1813-1901]; more French than the frivolous elegance of a [Jean-Philippe] Rameau [1683-1764] or of a [François] Couperin [1668-1733]? Do these “modus operandi” not form (and thereby represent) the best traits of these musicians’ personalities?

Art, therefore, does have a homeland [nation]. The establishment of the Russian School, by five obscure, long-disdained composers, constitutes one of the greatest miracles of modern times. Within a few [short] years, this fertile patch of truth has, enriched their country with the world’s most original music.

How did they achieve this magnificent result so quickly?

Firstly, by the tenacity of their will power to attain a precise objective: to bequeath to Russia music from other regions. Then, they would follow their inexorable conviction that a “national” music would transcend any other influence, and that only artists endowed with the spirit of their race would be deemed superior to any of their rivals.

One might well call this conceit, but of a healthy sort, as [their] experience proved.

Firstly, they decided to react aggressively against the German and Italian influences that had reigned over the arts in Russia, and above all, against the “worldliness” represented by the “Germanizing”[ in the sense of “Germanophile”] Tchaikovsky or by the Jew [Nikolai] Rubinstein. Then, they posited the following principles of composition:

1. To accept technique as their only external influence. Some, such as Moussorgsky and Balakirev, went even further by exaggerating their independence, declaring themselves passionately autodidactic.
2. The study of folklore and the sources of its inspiration: legends, history and popular tradition.
3. The analysis of popular song from three different standpoints: their diverse and cunningly capricious rhythmic construction; their melodic contours, most especially those which affront the monotonous strictures of their respective periods; from their inherent modalities, which engender harmonies (and harmonic progressions) natural to them:
   • To study the naivety through which joy, sadness, passion and religious fervor are expressed. To allow one’s self to be impregnated with these expressive virtues. To examine, individually, different traditional styles: the narrative song, the love song, the dances and the canticles.
   • To proscribe any traditional formal schemes that might interfere with a melody’s rhythmic, melodic, modal or folkloric properties. Symphonic poems and works for the stage should be inspired only by nationalistic subjects; rhythm and chant should be set in accordance with local folklore, and harmony should be derived from modality.
   • Popular themes, songs, issues, should be woven into the very fabric of a piece. Development sections should be constructed around them in such a way that they reflect and not eclipse their nature. Ancient melodies should be revived and innovated without losing their
primal essence. One’s goal should be able to think and compose in the musical syntax native to the race in question.

To these general principles, César Cui, one of the Mighty Five, added the following:

1. Make no concession to any public hostile to this new system. Don’t even be pre-occupied with success or failure;
2. The intrinsic properties of dramatic music (opera, ballet, symphonic music) must project as does absolute music; a fragment unworthy of a place within a symphony has no place within an opera.
3. The psyche of the individual character must at all times dominate the musical commentary.
4. The historical perspective is of great importance and must be emphasized by a style inherently evocative of its time. Similarly, regional settings must be accurately reflected by studying and applying local colors.
5. Operatic form must not remain fossilized within traditional molds; rather, it must depend upon the parameters of the drama itself. One must uncover the correct structural accentuation as spontaneous and faithful interpreter of the poem.
6. Technical considerations are secondary and must be subjugated to the afore-cited objectives.

Such was the doctrine of the Russian Five. The extraordinary result of its practical application bespeaks its excellence: the masterpieces of Balakirev, Rimsky-Korsakov, Borodin and Moussorgsky are its testimonials.

Why, therefore, would a phenomenon so successful in Russia not be applicable to Brittany?

This is precisely what occurred to the six [sic] Celtic musicians who founded L’Association des Compositeurs bretons in 1912. [On this point, sources differ; some sources claim an initial founding membership of eight, others, seven. Added to the six composers mentioned above (including Ladmirault himself) we have included Louis Aubert and Charles-Auguste Collin.]

Because Brittany, like it or not, is hardly a province, but a nation: through its race, its language, its special mentality, its traditions, its admirable folklore, unrelated to France’s, and its indigenous folk music.

This was brought to light very clearly by one of its new associates. In an article written for (the journal of) the Société Internationale de Musique on 12-15 April 1912, M. Jean Laporte wrote:

“There exists an (authentic) Breton music; this affirmation will/may surprise many; others, who have vacationed in Brittany and heard a melody here and there, will smile, claiming this to be ‘much ado about nothing’. But I categorically and emphatically uphold this phrase: there is an (indigenous) Breton music; I take this even a step further: it is (quite) possible that this music has taken on considerable importance as it can become the fount from which western music will rejuvenate itself.

... Nearly inexhaustible mines of music, through the numbers and varieties of Soniou and Gwergio brought up to date [M. Jean Laporte omits the marvelous melodies for bagpipes collected by Narcisse Quellien 1848-1902, François-Jacob and others]... melodies embodied with a multiplicity of meanings and powerful range, of luminous colorings and of singular originality; inexhaustible chiefly because they herald the existence of the following two elements: original modes and rhythms.

On the modes: one would need an entire volume to be able to define the rich modality of Breton music; the Breton diatonic system, more complete than that of ancient Greece, derives directly from the pentatonic scale which one finds all over the world, and it is through this phenomenon that the music of Brittany brings us to the threshold of the oldest traditions of [what we perceive to be] classical music.

On rhythm: the Breton musical phrase doesn’t follow the rules of Vierbeinkigkeit; it evolves from two to seven measures’ length; it rounds itself off, expands [soars] and contracts through its innate, deceptive intricacies.

Bringing these riches to public attention required some sort of organization. An Association of Breton Composers was recently founded and wishes to be this instrument. It is imperative that a Breton, suffused [from birth] with the fullness of his musical ancestry, yet one who
permits himself to be possessed by the creative inspiration of his homeland, present the musical patrimony awaited by the people of l’Arvor [the sea] and l’Argoat [the forests]: he will be Brittany’s Moussorgsky!...

L’Association des Compositeurs bretons gave several concerts in Paris between 1912 and 1914. The success that greeted them was proof enough of their vitality, and its musicians are worthy of mention here: Louis Vuillemin, author of the picturesque orchestral suite, En Cornouaille (“In [Breton] Cornwall”), which now belongs to the repertory of the Concerts Pasdeloup; Paul Le Flem, composer of both Soirs armoricains and his Quintette, one of the most significant works of the last fifteen years, remarkable by its dramatic sweep and inspiration; Maurice Duhamel, learned folklorist, composer, electifying politician and author, a true Renaissance man who, today, works in international relations in Breiz-Asan. He has enhanced his collections of traditionally sober Breton and Gallo melodies by affording them delightful accompaniments; Paul Martineau (b 1890), who died in 1915, was the youngest member of L’Association des Compositeurs bretons; and, were he be alive today, he should have become one of its finest contemporary composers. His Sonate for violin and piano (1911) discloses his powerful originality; his Suite orchestrale sur des Airs nantais ("Orchestral Suite on Melodies from the Nantes Region") is comparable to Guillaume Lekeu’s [1870-94] ... sur des Airs angevins ("...on Melodies from the Angers Region"). The same florid inspiration, the same inspiration and depth... And finally, we add to these now known names that of our Honourary President, Guy Ropartz, whose numerous and powerful symphonies, sonatas, and quartets rank with those of the Great Masters. The Germans consider him as the greatest “French” musician.”

Let us [now] hasten to “disconnect,” and to conclude this long article by citing the homage paid to Brittany by the traditionally tough critic from Toulouse, Jean Poueigh (1876-1958), just after the first concert given by the Association des compositeurs bretons. This impartial opinion of an ornery musical censor - recently compared to the most sonorous letter of the alphabet [“Q,” homonym for cul (one’s backside)] by the facetious Erik Satie [1866-1925] - is proof enough of its sincerity:

No other region, other than Brittany, seems able to unite with an intensity as moving, the characteristics best suited to generation musical inspiration. The bitter melancholy of the megaliths, the rustic grandeur of coastlines, the implacable mystery of the of the treetops bathing in a poetic dreamworld, nostalgic and legendary: anything and everything inspires one’s imagination”.

— Paul Ladmirault

********

That Paul Ladmirault’s tract coincided with both the preparation and publication of Maurice Duhamel’s political manifesto, La Question bretonne (André Delpeuch, 1929) could not have been coincidental. It would be difficult to imagine that these old friends and colleagues, co-founders of L’Association des compositeurs bretons, did not continue exchanging ideas and sharing common objectives, if not actual literary and musical manuscripts. Combining the verve of the artist with the rhetoric of the politician, Duhamel set out to inspire everyday Bretons to struggle for the survival of their identity as a race, and to work towards a decentralized, federalist France, wherein all minorities would find equal political status and cultural autonomy. (To understand the degree to which the State was not amused, the reader is invited to consult Francis Le Squer’s excellent, comprehensive dissertation Les Espoirs, les efforts et les épreuves du mouvement breton catholique de 1891 à 1945.29 Duhamel included as Appendix his epistle of Breton autonomy, entitled, quite simply, [une] Déclaration, adoptée à Châteaulin, le 18 août 1929, par le Congrès du ‘Parti Autonomiste Breton’. We will now paraphrase its seven, impassioned sections:

I.  We are not separatists; separation is not an option. However, we reject assimilation as destructive to the material, cultural and moral interests of Brittany; we are not romantic reactionaries looking to revive the glories of the ancient Duchy; respectful and admiring of this legacy, we look towards a future within a more democratic France; we are not anti-French; we bear no hostility towards the French

28His pseudonym was Octave Séré.
peoples, of which we are one. Yet, we view as illegitimate the centralized authority imposed by an opportunistic, imperialist Paris of 1790, which violated the provisions of the 1532 Treaty of Union;

we will rise up against Paris’ current indifference to Brittany’s economic needs, against Paris’ incomprehension of Brittany’s cultural and moral aspirations, and against Paris’ militancy against the Breton language;

we denounce the hypocrisy of the still-centralized government’s tenet of France consisting of a people “one and indivisible, as France’s population is heterogenic and diverse;

II. Brittany has enjoyed a past worthy of statehood; she was born of roots different from France’s; her language was brought to her by Celts who had emigrated from Great Britain during the Middle Ages; from this language she developed her own, individual civilization;

III. any nation or people incapable of self-government, for any reason, is doomed to decline rapidly; Brittany, since its annexation in 1532, it remained relatively ignored, and since the centralization of powers in 1790, the Breton nation has devolved into a lethargic and poverty-stricken people; her industrial and linguistic bases, her social fabric and structures were left to decay;

IV. we lay claim to administrative and political autonomy, to be administered by a Parlement breton which would restructure French law in favor of Breton societal autonomy; this would include the creation of, among others, an autonomous Ministry of Education; a renaissance of Breton culture and traditional arts; a restructuring of taxation laws so as to better benefit the per-capita contributions of the Bretons relative to the French; in addition, this would secure a more effective transfer of federal funds to assure improved much-needed railway links, highways, commercial and military ports.

V. such autonomy cannot possibly present a threat to France;

VI. we envision a new France as a federal state, to follow the model of Germany;

VII. we remain loyal to France, as too much common blood has been spilled and too many tears have been shed over the wars we have both endured and shared; we leave it to France to allow us to co-exist as Bretons and as French citizens, and to work with her in the preservation of the common good of the oldest democracy in Western Europe.

As Véfa de Bellaing’s esteemed Dictionnaire des compositeurs de musique en Bretagne systematically instructs, Ladmirault’s and Duhamel’s writings produced the effect desired by their respective authors: to operate as the artistic and spiritual genetrix for future generations of Breton classical composers. Yet, inspired as they were by these paradigmatic treatises, the next generations remained fully conscious of the old adage that politicizing art usually leads more to disdain and failure than to praise and actual success. However moved they might have been by their implacable idealism and nationalism, the majority of Breton composers proved themselves extraordinarily loyal to the ringing ethos of l’art pour l’art, and eschewed suffusing their compositions with political innuendo. Just as the Mighty Five had done nearly a generation earlier, and just as their disciples Sergei Prokofiev (1891-1953) and Dmitri Shostakovitch (1906-75) would continue to do — vulnerable as they were to the often ridiculous premises and antics of the Soviet Politburo — future generations of Breton composers continue to draw from their sacred canticles and secular folk melodies, from their legends, their mythologies and history, from their religious traditions, their saints and their sinners. Combining the fullness of these resources with the rhetorical thrust of their venerated, native instruments, les Huit suffused the harmonic syntax of mainstream Europe with an unique artistic dialectic, incontrovertibly their own.
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